

App. No. 09/862,390  
Amendment dated October 14, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2005

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 10, 2005 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 31-33 were rejected by the Office Action. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 31-33 are amended. No new matter has been added. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,727,923B1 issued to *McInerney* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,966B1 issued to *Kalish et al.* Applicants respectfully disagree.

*McInerney* teaches the creation of internet location objects through the drag-and-drop manipulation of text. When an object is dragged from within an application into a system window, a drag object describing what is being dragged is passed from the application to the operating system. An application may be aware of internet location objects and, when an object is dragged from within the application into the system window, may specify that the object being dragged is a URL. Alternatively, the application may support generic text drag-and-drop, in which case the application specifies a text drag flavor as part of the drag object. Depending on the drag flavor, a file manager either causes an internet location object to be created directly or intelligently parses a text string that has been dragged and dropped onto the user desktop to determine if the text string is likely a URL. If a text string specified as part of a text flavor drag object is found to likely be a URL, then an internet object is created. Otherwise, a different behavior is followed.

*Kalish et al.* teaches accessing a hypertext language based page using wireless phone apparatus dialup faculties. A URL dialup utility enables the use of shortcut codes as substitutes for URL addresses. The dialup utility translates the shortcut codes according to pre-defined rules. The pre-defined rules can be implemented using any translator program or based upon a database of URL addresses.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a "method for providing shortcuts in a mobile electronic device, the method comprising: providing a shortcut data store configurable to contain shortcuts to a plurality of targets, wherein the shortcut data store comprises more than one type of target; monitoring user input to the mobile electronic device from a first application; determining

App. No. 09/862,390  
Amendment dated October 14, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2005

whether the user input is a shortcut input, wherein the shortcut input comprises a tag that corresponds to a target associated with a second application in the shortcut data store; if the user input is a shortcut input, locating the target that corresponds to the tag in the shortcut data store; and executing the second application to access the located target.”

Neither *McInerney*, *Kalish et al.* nor any combination thereof teach the limitations of amended Claim 1. Specifically, the cited references do not teach that “monitoring user input to the mobile electronic device from a first application; determining whether the user input is a shortcut input, wherein the shortcut input comprises a tag that corresponds to a target associated with a second application in the shortcut data store; if the user input is a shortcut input, locating the target that corresponds to the tag in the shortcut data store; and executing the second application to access the located target.” Thus, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claims 11, 21 and 31-33, as amended, include limitations substantially similar (albeit different in other important ways) to the limitations claimed in Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable. Thus, Claims 11, 21 and 31-33 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Furthermore, dependent Claims 2, 6, 7, 12, 16, 17, 22, 26 and 27 are allowable for at least the same reasons that the base claims on which they rely are allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 31-33 are submitted to be allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.


App. No. 09/862,390  
Amendment dated October 14, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2005

### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentably distinct. Applicants reserve the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903



John J. Farrell  
Registration No. 57,291  
Direct Dial: 206.342.6261  
[JJF/ab]

**27488**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE